~ P TO RFP CC NO

- 39)

C OSED

TION IT'M STATUS

₫

TR 47 TOVALS

SEGEG ROCKY FLATS

EG&G ROCKY FLATS INC ROCKY FLATS PLANT P O BOX 464 GOLDEN COLORADO 80402 0464 (303) 966 7000

June 16 1994

94 RF 06627

Scott R Grace
Environmental Restoration Division
DOE/RFFO

IMPACT OF COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (CDH) COMMENTS ON THE OPERABLE UNIT (OU) 1 CORRECTIVE MEASURES STUDY/FEASIBILITY STUDY (CMS/FS) TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM (TM) II – RZH 018 94

EG&G Rocky Flats Inc (EG&G) and its CMS/FS subcontractor Dames & Moore have reviewed the regulatory agency comments received on TM 11 and have concluded that several issues unless resolved with the agencies will impact the current schedule for producing the OU 1 CMS/FS. These issues are related to comments received from CDH and are not relevant to comments received from EPA. In general EPA comments are consistent with the informal discussions held during previous meetings. CDH comments however are inconsistent with the OU 1 approach discussed repeatedly with the State and with previous comments received on TM 10 from both EPA and the State. In general, the issues associated with CDH comments on TM 11 are the following.

CDH believes that development and screening of remedial action alternatives must begin at the IHSS and source level. The State has taken the stance that corrective measures must be selected for each IHSS and source area that are fully protective and meet the appropriate Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs). The State defines a protective level as an excess cancer risk of 1 x 10 6 and/or a hazard index of unity and assumes that if an IHSS with contamination is determined to be currently protective and meets all applicable Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) a presumptive remedy of no action may be proposed.

CDH believes that alternatives for surface soil hot spot remediation should be included in the OU 1 remedy selection process

CDH has stated that in the case of IHSS 119 1 alternatives must be developed that include the remediation of subsurface soils as well as groundwater

The first issue above impacts the CMS/FS as well as the programmatic approach that is currently being developed for other OUs. The State is attempting to enforce remedial action evaluation of any areas that represent a risk level greater than 1 x 10-6. In the case of OU 1, the suggestion that the presumptive remedy of no action be assumed for IHSSs below this value is impossible to implement without guidance as to what land use scenario is assumed. In addition, the baseline risk assessment methodology currently does not evaluate risk at the IHSS level and would have to be modified for all OUs if this screening of IHSSs is required. Preliminarly remediation goals (PRGs) could be used to determine if an IHSS is protective since they are based on a risk level of 1 x 10-6. However, a land use scenario would still have to be specified in order to select the appropriate PRC for comparison against existing concentrations at each IHSS. In summary, CDH must provide clear guidance as to how the 1 x 10-6 level should be applied for each IHSS in order to determine if that

ADMIN RECORD

A DUCT COTTE

Scott R Grace June 16 1994 94 RF 06627 Page 2

IHSS currently represents a protective risk level. The Department of Energy/Rocky Flats Field Office (DOE/RFFO) should make a concerted effort to ensure that the guidance CDH provides in terms of where the 1 x 10 6 risk levels are applied is realistic for the expected future use of Rocky Flats Plant.

On January 28 1994 during a meeting with EG&G DOE EPA and CDH Dames & Moore distributed an outline for TM 11 and discussed the approach toward developing remedial action alternatives for OU 1. At that time Dames & Moore presented an initial list of alternatives for OU 1 and explained how three general areas were targeted for remediation. The area south of Building 881 IHSS 119.1 and the area just east and south of IHSS 119.2. These general areas were being addressed jointly in some alternatives while other alternatives only targeted remediation of IHSS 119.1. This approach was suggested as a method of comparing the options of sitewide remediation to the 10.6 risk level against remediation of only the most contaminated area in OU.1 (to Federal maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)). At no time did either agency suggest approaching development of remedial action alternatives on an IHSS by IHSS basis.

On May 13 1994 EG&G once again met with the agencies to discuss their preliminary comments on the alternatives presented in TM 11 During that meeting the agencies stated that they were generally pleased with the content of the report. However, some changes were suggested. During the meeting, it was decided that a new modified limited action alternative would be included, along with a phased approach to the thermally enhanced vacuum extraction alternatives. Once again, at no time during this meeting did either agency suggest approaching development of remedial action alternatives on an IHSS by IHSS basis. Formal comments were going to follow within the next week, but CDH is formal comments did not appear until June 6, 1994.

Similarly during these meetings where the approach used in developing remedial action alternatives was presented to the agencies. CDH did not raise the issues of the surface and subsurface soil media undergoing analysis for separate alternative development. From the onset the State has been informed that only the medium of groundwater would be targeted for alternative development. Again the recent CDH comments received on TM 11 do not coincide with the approach presented to the agencies since the beginning of the year. In addition, TM 10 clearly identified the media being targeted in the OU 1 CMS/FS, and in two sets of EPA comments and one set of CDH comments, these issues were never raised.

In terms of impacts to the OU 1 CMS/FS it is unlikely that a quality draft report could be produced by August of this year if separate alternatives would have to be developed for each IHSS and each medium as suggested by CDH. Also if certain IHSSs are to be screened out from further consideration early in the CMS/FS, then CDH must provide guidance as to how the 1 x 10 6 nsk level should be applied. This IHSS by IHSS determination of whether remedial action evaluation is required should be handled separately from the CMS/FS because of the amount of scrutiny it will undergo. Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) issues (which are currently undecided) and PRGs will both play a role in determining if an IHSS is currently contaminated to levels that are not deemed protective.

I would also recommend that if the changes requested by CDH are to be incorporated in the OU 1 CMS/FS then a revised TM 11 should first be produced to ensure that we have satisfied the requirements of the State prior to conducting the detailed analysis of alternatives. This would

Scott R Grace June 16 1994 94 RF 06627 Page 3

obviously result in substantial delays to our current schedule. Producing a TM 11 under the methodology proposed by CDH would require at least six weeks not including joint EG&G and DOE review and this is assuming that CDH provides clear guidance on how the determination of a protective level should be made for evaluating whether certain IHSSs should be included in the development of remedial action alternatives

Currently the CMS/FS report is being prepared under the following guidelines

Only the medium of groundwater is being formally targeted for remedial action alternative development although subsurface soils are being treated in IHSS 119 1 through the proposed alternatives using vapor extraction steam treatment and excavation. Surface soil hot spots are assumed to be removed as part of each alternative. Due to their limited size, they do not warrant separate consideration as a medium for alternative development.

IHSS 119 1 is being targeted for remediation under certain alternatives since it is the only area showing contaminant concentrations consistently above Federal Maximum contaminant levels (MCLs). Other IHSSs are targeted for remediation under the sitewide OU alternatives. These alternatives will attempt to remediate the site to the 10 6 risk level overall (under a residential scenario) which means that all IHSSs at OU 1 would be evaluated to the protectiveness level suggested by CDH regardless of whether or not they are evaluated independently or as a group

I have instructed Dames & Moore to proceed with the CMS/FS under these guidelines and will not seek to address the written comments recently received from the State. As it stands now however. I believe that it is imperative that we meet with the agencies to determine what approach would be acceptable for the CMS/FS report. If any of the changes mentioned throughout this letter are to be incorporated in the report, then I would suggest using the argument that CDH has deviated from the course set in all of our previous meetings to convince them to allow more time for preparation of the CMS/FS report. Please call me if you have questions regarding the material presented in this letter.

R Zeke Houk

Operable Unit 1 Project Manager Remediation Project Management

Mach

ılm

Orig and 1 cc - S R Grace